Moreover, this cannot be that Love neither, which is described in Plato's *Symposiwm* (as some learned men have conceived), that was begotten between Penia and Porus, this being[1] not a divine but demoniac thing (as the philosopher there declares), no God, but a demon only, or of a middle nature. For it is nothing but ^XojcctXia, or the love of pulchritude as such, which, though rightly used, may perhaps wing and inspire the mind to noble and generous attempts, and beget a scornful disdain in it of mean, dirty, and sordid things ; yet is capable of being abused also, and then it will strike downward into brutishness and $ensu-ality. But at best it is an affection belonging only to imperfect and parturient beings; and therefore could not be the first principle of all things. Wherefore, we see no very great reason but that, in a rectified and qualified sense, this may pass for true theology; that Love is the supreme Deity and original of all things; namely, if by it be meant eternal, self-originated, intellectual Love, or essential and substantial good ness,, that having an infinite overflowing fulness and fecundity, dispenses itself uninvidiously, according to the best wisdom, sweetly governs all, without any force or violence (all things being naturally subject to its authority, and readily obeying its laws), and reconciles the whole world into harmony. For the Scripture telling us, that God is love, seems to warrant thus much to us, that love in some rightly qualified-sense is God.

xix. But we are to omit the fabulous age, and to descend to the philosophical, to inquire there, who they were among the professed philosophers, who atheixed in that manner before described* It